

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

TOM SEVE,

Case No. 3:20-cv-00663-MMD-WGC

Plaintiff,

ORDER

v.

GITTERE, *et al.*,

Defendants.

This action began with a *pro se* civil rights complaint filed under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 by Tom Seve, who is currently incarcerated at the Ely State Prison. On December 2, 2020, the Court issued an order denying Plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, without prejudice, because the application was incomplete. (ECF No. 3 at 2.) The Court ordered Plaintiff to file a fully complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis* or pay the full filing fee of \$400 on or before February 1, 2021. (*Id.* at 2.) The February 1, 2021 deadline has now expired, and Plaintiff has not filed another application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, paid the full \$400 filing fee, or otherwise responded to the Court's order.

District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and "[i]n the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal" of a case. *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action, with prejudice, based on a party's failure to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. See *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995) (affirming dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (affirming dismissal for failure to

1 comply with local rule requiring *pro se* plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); *Malone*
 2 *v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (affirming dismissal for failure
 3 to comply with court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986)
 4 (affirming dismissal for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

5 In determining whether to dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, failure to obey
 6 a court order, or failure to comply with local rules, the court must consider several factors:
 7 (1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to
 8 manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring
 9 disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives.
 10 See *Thompson*, 782 F.2d at 831; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1423-24; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at
 11 130; *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1260-61; *Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 53.

12 Here, the Court finds that the first two factors, the public's interest in expeditiously
 13 resolving this litigation and the Court's interest in managing the docket, weigh in favor of
 14 dismissal. The third factor, risk of prejudice to Defendants, also weighs in favor of
 15 dismissal, since a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay
 16 in filing a pleading ordered by the court or prosecuting an action. See *Anderson v. Air*
 17 *West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor—public policy favoring
 18 disposition of cases on their merits—is greatly outweighed by the factors in favor of
 19 dismissal discussed herein. Finally, a court's warning to a party that his failure to obey
 20 the court's order will result in dismissal satisfies the "consideration of alternatives"
 21 requirement. *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 132-33; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d
 22 at 1424. The Court's order requiring Plaintiff to file another application to proceed *in forma*
 23 *pauperis* or pay the full \$400 filing fee on or before February 1, 2021 expressly stated:

24 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, if Plaintiff does not file a fully complete
 25 application to proceed in forma pauperis with all three documents or pay the
 26 full \$400 filing fee for a civil action on or before February 1, 2021, this case
 27 will be subject to dismissal without prejudice for Plaintiff to refile the case
 with the Court, under a new case number, when Plaintiff has all three
 documents needed to file a complete application to proceed in forma
 pauperis or pays the full \$400 filing fee.


28 ///

1 (ECF No. 3 at 3). Thus, Plaintiff had adequate warning that dismissal would result from
2 noncompliance with the Court's order to file another application to proceed *in forma*
3 *pauperis* or pay the full \$400 filing fee on or before February 1, 2021.

4 It is therefore ordered that this action is dismissed without prejudice based on
5 Plaintiff's failure to file another application to proceed *in forma pauperis* or pay the full
6 \$400 filing fee in compliance with this Court's order dated December 2, 2020. (*Id.*)

7 The Clerk of Court is directed to enter judgment accordingly and close the case.
8 No other documents may be filed in this now-closed case.

9 DATED THIS 11th Day of February 2021.

10 

11 _____
12 MIRANDA M. DU
13 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28